

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAY 01 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MIGUEL ANGEL ARAIZA-RAMIREZ,
et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-73073

Agency Nos. A79-536-558
A79-536-559
A79-536-560

MEMORANDUM *

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted April 22, 2008**

Before: GRABER, FISHER, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

Miguel Angel Araiza-Ramirez, Carmen de la Torre, and their daughter,
natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), we deny the petition for review.

In their motion to reopen, petitioners reiterated the contentions they raised in their appeal brief. The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen on the ground that it failed to meet the regulatory requirements. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(1) (a motion to reopen shall state new facts and be supported by affidavits or other evidentiary material).

The BIA also did not abuse its discretion in construing petitioners' motion as a motion to reconsider and denying it because the motion failed to state any errors of fact or law as required by the regulations. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.